



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,231	11/28/2003	Thiam Heng Goh	22.3083	1230

26932 7590 11/10/2005

JEFFREY E. DALY
GRANT PRIDECO, L.P.
400 N. SAM HOUSTON PARKWAY EAST
SUITE 900
HOUSTON, TX 77060

EXAMINER

TOLAN, EDWARD THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3725

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/707,231

Applicant(s)

GOH ET AL.

Examiner

Edward Tolan

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12-14,16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12-14,16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9-25-05

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3,5-10,12-14,16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Francia (5,417,095) in view of Adamson et al. (4,507,027) and further in view of Bajraszewski et al. (5,528,917). Francia discloses a tool holder (16), a boring bar (12) and a cold wheel (21). Francia does not disclose that the boring bar is movable relative to the tool holder. Adamson teaches that a boring bar (12) is movable relative to a tool shank (14) laterally in a first direction (column 2, lines 23-26). A key (38) fits into first and second slots (34,36) in the boring bar and tool holder in order to prevent rotation of the boring bar in a second direction (column 2, lines 58-61). A machine screw (40) is used to lock the key in order to limit travel of the boring bar relative to the tool holder in the first direction. The tool holder comprises a cylindrical section (19) and a rectangular clamp block (48) coupled to the cylindrical section. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide means for moving the boring bar relative to the tool holder of Francia as taught by Adamson in order to position the tool relative to a workpiece.

Francia in view of Adamson does not disclose a piston to move the tool. Bajraszewski teaches a piston/cylinder (30,50) operated by fluid under pressure which

Art Unit: 3725

is used to move a cold rolling tool (28). A pressure gauge (46, column 3, lines 20-40) indicates a load on the tool. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to provide Francis in view of Adamson with a piston cylinder means as taught by Bajraszewski in order to move the tool so that a rolling force is monitored and controlled during the threading operation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8-15-2005 have been considered. Force controlled cold rolling/threading as taught by Bajraszewski in which a pressure gauge is used to control forming tools is known in the art. It would have been obvious to supply such control to Francia and Adamson.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ed Tolan whose telephone number is 571-272-4525.

ED TOLAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
